Minutes of the Agency Contract Review Board

23 June 1971

PRESENT:

d.

case.

2.

of the case. tion system.

the Board on the

•								
•								
								`
	•							
1. Th	he Board r	net to hear	and make	recommenda	tions to the	Director of	.*	
Logistics or		wing cases	•	,	•			
•	a.							25X′
	b.							
	c.							

Excluded from autematic Declassification Review by NGA
Approved For Release 2006/02/05 CHE

opened the meeting by calling on

deferred to

The selection of the contractor was based on (a) the best technical

to brief

the negotiator

25X1

25X1

Approved For ease 2006/02 6 CARDP74B0053 000100200010-1

Minutes of the ACRB - 23 June 1971

proposal, (b) the lowest cost, and (c) the best delivery schedule. had originally proposed costs of Their final submission being a firm-fixed price (FFP) proposal of This last proposal was negotiated down to a round figure of and included an additional piece of equipment valued at plus wiring diagrams and manuals which were not included in the original proposal.	25X1
3. The Board was satisfied with the contracting officer's efforts and agreed in a recommendation that the Director of Logistics approve the case for negotiation and execution without further Board review.	
4. asked to be allowed to present the case at this time as he felt that it was rather cut-and-dryed. The Board concurred in his request. stated that 15 requests for proposals had been issued and that 7 responses were received. was chosen from the seven responses after a comparison evaluation	25X1] 25X1
was completed by the technical representative. He noted further that the choice was	25X1
based on price, reputation of contractor, and available in-house equipment essential to the efficient performance of the contract. The fact that has the equipment	25X1
to the efficient performance of the contract. The fact that has the equipment on hand was a significant factor in the choice.	25X1
and on the detail analysis and methodical evaluation that had been made on this case. commented that he would like to see more cases supported by an evaluation of competing contractors.	
5. asked if the reasonableness of the number of labor hours had been reviewed by the technical representative. Noting that the audit report stated that the labor hours had not been evaluated and recommended that the techni-	
cal representative should review the item. stated that he was satisfied	25X1
with the contractor's labor hour proposal. expressed concern that there was no evidence in the docket or supporting documentation to substantiate the	25X1
fact that a review had been made of the labor hourspointed out that the statement was a boiler-plate type paragraph and that there was continuing dialogue	25X1
between the auditors and the technical representatives where serious difference existsnoted that the Business Justification contains a statement to the effect that the labor hours had been reviewed.	
6asked the Board members for their comments. They expressed satisfaction with the case and recommended the Director of Logistics approve the negotiation and execution of the contract without further Board review.	

Minutes of the ACRB - 23 June 1971

7. asked that the Procurement Policy Panel discuss and	
review the procedures employed to verify that comments contained in the audit	
reports are being reviewed and responded to by the appropriate persons.	
8. The case was also presented	
by He informed the Board that this contract was for the purchase of	
a prototype high capacity processor for The contractor has	25X
proposed a CPFF contract in the amount of He noted that we had pur-	25X
chased three processors of a similar type several years ago on a fixed-price	
contract. In addition we had a cost-sharing contract for the development of	
with this contractor. This effort however is based on	
a different design concept and is substantially beyond the present state-of-the-art.	
was questioned concerning the possibility of commercial value.	
responded noting that this effort would go beyond commercial needs	
and that there would be no commercial market for the processor. Concerning the	
possibility that there would be other Government agencies interested in the develop-	
ments from the contract, was unable to speculate on the use of the	
equipment beyond our own Agency.	
<u> </u>	
9. asked why it was necessary for the contract to be classified.	
In response, it was noted that all our contracts in this area have been traditionally	
classified. In addition, the material is made for us exclusively and that similar	
contracts written by the Air Force are classified. noted that there	25X
was a need for a "sensitivity" course for contracting officers and technical represen-	
tatives.	
10. When was asked if there would be any automatic follow-on he	
answered by stating that each requirement is individually handled on separate con-	
tracts. further remarked that he felt that the proposed cost of	25X
was a little high and would be negotiated down if at all possible. In addition, consid-	25/
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
eration would also be given to another form of contract.	
asked the Board members for their opinions and comments.	
The members were satisfied with the efforts and intent of the contracting officer and	
recommended the Director of Logistics approve the case for negotiation and execution	
without further Board review.	

Minutes of the ACRB - 23 June 1971

12requested to be allowed to present a case that had just been approved by the Executive Director-Comptroller. He noted that the case would be negotiated by the and that it was necessary to get the material and the recommendations of the Board to the contracting officer as soon as possible.	25X1
13. With the Board's concurrencecontinued with his briefing. He	25X1
noted that the had proposed a CPFF contract in the	
amount of for the fabrication of These	25X1
units will be	25X1
The Board accepted	25X1
proposal and agreed in a recommendation that the Director of Logistics approve the	
negotiation and execution of the proposed contractual action.	
	25X1